

**REVIEW OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTAL ENTITY
2010-11 FISCAL YEAR AUDIT REPORTS
PREPARED BY INDEPENDENT CERTIFIED
PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS**



STATE OF FLORIDA
AUDITOR GENERAL
DAVID W. MARTIN, CPA

The review was coordinated by Anita Marlowe, CPA, and supervised by David T. Ward, CPA. Please address inquiries regarding this report to Marilyn D. Rosetti, CPA, Audit Manager, by e-mail at marilynrosetti@aud.state.fl.us or by telephone at (850) 487-9031.

This report and other reports prepared by the Auditor General can be obtained on our Web site at www.myflorida.com/audgen; by telephone at (850) 487-9175; or by mail at G74 Claude Pepper Building, 111 West Madison Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1450.

**REVIEW OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTAL ENTITY
2010-11 FISCAL YEAR AUDIT REPORTS
PREPARED BY INDEPENDENT CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS**

SUMMARY

Pursuant to Section 218.39, Florida Statutes¹, counties and certain municipalities and special districts are required to provide for annual financial audits conducted by independent certified public accountants (CPAs). Audit reports for the 2010-11 fiscal year were required to be submitted to us within 45 days after delivery of the audit report to the local governmental entity's governing body, but no later than 9 months after the end of the fiscal year. We are required to review all local governmental entity audit reports submitted pursuant to Section 218.39, Florida Statutes. In addition, pursuant to Section 215.97(11)(f), Florida Statutes, we are required to perform ongoing reviews of a sample of financial reporting packages submitted pursuant to Section 215.97, Florida Statutes (the *Florida Single Audit Act*). We reviewed audit reports for 1,205 local governmental entities, and determined that the audit reports were generally presented in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards, generally accepted accounting principles, and Rules of the Auditor General. However, we noted instances in which the audit reports were not submitted timely or were not prepared in accordance with all applicable requirements, as follows:

Finding No. 1: Audit reports were not submitted to us for 16 municipalities and 37 special districts required to provide for an audit. Also, 2 municipalities and 22 special districts that may have been required to provide for an audit did not submit an audit report to us. Additionally, 181 local governmental entities did not submit the audit report timely, including 111 entities that did not submit the audit reports within the required 45-day time frame, and 70 entities that did not submit the audit reports by the 9-month deadline.

Finding No. 2: Our completeness reviews of 1,205 audit reports disclosed instances of noncompliance with certain requirements, primarily related to the auditors' reports, identification of audit findings by reference numbers, and identification of uncorrected findings from the two preceding financial audit reports.

Finding No. 3: Our comprehensive reviews of samples of audit reports disclosed several instances of noncompliance with generally accepted government auditing standards, generally accepted accounting principles, and Chapter 10.550, Rules of the Auditor General. Noncompliance was also disclosed related to the presentation of schedules of expenditures, and schedules of findings and questioned costs, for Federal awards and State financial assistance, respectively.

BACKGROUND

Section 218.39, Florida Statutes, provides for annual financial audits of each county, and for municipalities and special districts meeting certain revenue or expenditure/expense thresholds. Section 218.31(17), Florida Statutes, defines a financial audit as an examination of financial statements in order to express an opinion on the fairness with which they are presented in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP) and an examination to determine whether operations are properly conducted in accordance with legal and regulatory requirements. Financial audits must be conducted in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards and generally accepted government auditing standards (*Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller of the United States).

Section 218.39, Florida Statutes, establishes several requirements that independent CPAs must follow when conducting financial audits of local governmental entities. Independent CPAs performing these financial audits must:

- Prepare a management letter that is included as a part of the financial audit report;
- Discuss all findings that will be included in the financial audit report with the appropriate official(s); and
- Conduct the audits in accordance with Rules of the Auditor General.

¹ All references to the Florida Statutes are to the 2011 Statutes.

Additionally, the law requires that the entity’s officer respond in writing to findings contained in the audit report, and that the written response be submitted to the entity’s governing body within 30 days after delivery of the findings.

We have developed rules that provide, among other things, procedural guidelines for independent CPAs to follow to ensure compliance with the above requirements (Chapter 10.550, Rules of the Auditor General – Local Governmental Entity Audits). These rules require that the scope of a financial audit include: an examination of the financial statements in order to express an opinion on them; an examination to determine whether operations are properly conducted in accordance with legal and regulatory requirements; an examination of any additional financial information necessary to comply with GAAP; and, when applicable, the additional activities necessary to determine compliance with the Federal *Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996* and the *Florida Single Audit Act*. To assist auditors in complying with the requirements of generally accepted government auditing standards (GAGAS), GAAP, and applicable laws, rules, and regulations, we promulgated the Local Government Audit Report Review Guidelines. These rules and guidelines are available on our Web site.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Finding No. 1: Timely Submission of Audit Reports

Section 218.39(7), Florida Statutes, requires that the local governmental entity submit the audit report and a written response to any audit report findings to us within 45 days after delivery of the audit report to the entity’s governing body, but no later than 9 months after the end of the fiscal year. Table 1 shows noncompliance, or potential noncompliance, with the audit report submission requirements for the 2010-11 fiscal year as of September 20, 2012, and the previous four fiscal years.²

Table 1

Type of Exception	Fiscal Year				
	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
Audit required, but report not submitted.	53	48	40	57	30
Audit may have been required, but report not submitted.	24	13	15	37	31
Audit report not submitted within 45-day time frame.	111	107	107	67	93
Audit report submitted after June 30 th deadline.	70				
Audit report submitted after September 30 th deadline.		68	86	104	176

Source: Auditor General

Further, for the 2010-11 fiscal year information provided in Table 1:

- The 53 local governmental entities required to submit an audit report to us, but did not, included 16 municipalities and 37 special districts (see Exhibit A).
- For the 24 local governmental entities that may have been required to provide for an audit, but which had not submitted an audit report to us, it was not practicable for us to determine for the 2 municipalities and 22 special districts whether an audit was required based on the financial criteria specified in Section 218.39(1), Florida Statutes, because sufficient information was not readily available, either from the entity, the Florida Department of Financial Services’ records (because the entities had not filed annual financial reports, contrary to law), or other sources (see Exhibit B).
- Audit reports for 111 local governmental entities were not submitted to us within 45 days of delivery to the governing body (up to 108 days late) but were submitted before the 9-month deadline (see Exhibit C).

² Prior to the 2010-11 fiscal year, audit reports were due no later than 12 months after the end of the fiscal year.

- Audit reports for 70 local governmental entities were not submitted to us within the 9-month deadline (see Exhibit D).

Local governmental entities that fail to provide for audits may be subject to consequences prescribed in Section 11.40(2), Florida Statutes. Timely audits are necessary to ensure that management is promptly informed of control deficiencies and financial-related noncompliance. Additionally, timely filing of audit reports is necessary to allow timely review by appropriate Federal and State oversight agencies.

Recommendation: Local governmental entities should ensure that audit reports are completed and submitted within the required time frame.

Finding No. 2: Completeness Reviews

All 1,205 local governmental entity audit reports submitted to us as of July 18, 2012, pursuant to Section 218.39, Florida Statutes, were subjected to completeness reviews to determine: (1) whether the audit reports included the required financial statements, note disclosures, reports, and other items listed in Chapter 10.550, Rules of the Auditor General, and (2) the extent to which they complied, for selected significant matters, with GAGAS, GAAP, and Chapter 10.550, Rules of the Auditor General, as applicable.

Section 11.45(7)(b), Florida Statutes, requires us to request from local governmental entities significant items omitted from audit reports. Accordingly, for those audit reports that did not include required items, such as financial statements, required supplementary information, auditor's reports/management letter, and auditee's response, the local governmental entity was requested by letter to provide the missing items. We concurrently provided a copy of the letter to the local governmental entity's auditor. Local governmental entities are required to provide us with the requested items no later than 45 days after the date of our request.

For the 2010-11 fiscal year, 191 local governmental entities (including county agencies) were sent letters requesting items omitted from the audit report. Most of the items requested related to: (1) including reference numbers for each audit finding in report(s), schedule(s) or management letter, as applicable, or (2) identifying uncorrected audit findings from the two preceding financial audit reports. Of the 191 local governmental entities sent letters requesting items omitted from the audit report, 33 had not provided the requested items as of September 20, 2012, and, pursuant to Section 11.45(7)(b), Florida Statutes, we notified the Legislative Auditing Committee of those entities that had not provided the requested items.

Most of the audit reports included audited financial statements, and notes thereto, and the required auditor's reports on the financial statements and on internal control over financial reporting and compliance. Additionally, most reports reviewed were generally presented in accordance with GAGAS, GAAP, and Chapter 10.550, Rules of the Auditor General. The majority of the instances of noncompliance disclosed by our completeness reviews relate to: (1) presentation of the auditor's report on internal control over financial reporting and compliance in accordance with GAGAS, (2) identification of audit findings by reference numbers, and (3) identification of uncorrected findings in the preceding financial audit report that were also included in the second preceding financial audit report. For example:

- The auditor's report on internal control over financial reporting and compliance, where the auditors issued other than an unqualified opinion, did not include a description of the departure from the standard auditor's report on the financial statements for 12 (34 percent) of 35 applicable reports reviewed.
- Findings were not separately identified by reference numbers for 46 (14 percent) of 326 applicable reports with findings included in the report on internal control over financial reporting and compliance and 90 (23 percent) of 399 applicable reports with management letter findings.

- Contrary to Section 10.554(1)(i)1, Rules of the Auditor General, the auditor's management letter did not identify those uncorrected findings in the preceding financial audit report that were also included in the second preceding financial audit report for 86 (29 percent) of 298 applicable reports reviewed.

A summary of the deficiencies disclosed by our completeness reviews, with comparative prior year information, and an analysis of the deficiencies disclosed by our completeness reviews by type of local governmental entity, is included as Exhibit E.

External parties rely on audits to provide independent assessments of the accuracy and completeness of the financial statements, and to provide, for financial reporting, a means for evaluating the effectiveness of an entity's internal controls and determining the extent to which an entity has complied with applicable laws, rules, regulations, contractual requirements, and bond covenants. Accordingly, it is important that the various components of the audit report (auditor's reports and management letter, financial statements, notes to financial statements, etc.) be presented in accordance with GAGAS, GAAP, and Chapter 10.550, Rules of the Auditor General, so that the reader can form appropriate conclusions relating to the audited entity.

Recommendation: Independent auditors of local governmental entities should ensure that their reports are presented in accordance with GAGAS and Chapter 10.550, Rules of the Auditor General. In addition, auditors should ensure that audit findings include reference numbers and that uncorrected audit findings in the preceding financial audit report that were also included in the second preceding financial audit report are identified in accordance with Chapter 10.550, Rules of the Auditor General.

Finding No. 3: Comprehensive Reviews

In addition to the completeness reviews, we made more comprehensive reviews of selected audit reports for the 2010-11 fiscal year, as follows:

- We reviewed a sample of 60 audit reports (4 counties, 19 municipalities, and 37 special districts) to determine the extent of compliance, on a more comprehensive basis, with GAGAS, GAAP, and Chapter 10.550, Rules of the Auditor General, as they apply to financial statements and notes thereto. The majority of deficiencies disclosed by our comprehensive reviews pertained to financial statements and note disclosures, but we also noted deficiencies with required supplementary information and other required reports. For example, the notes did not disclose excesses of expenditures over appropriations in individual funds presented in the budgetary comparison schedules for 4 (44 percent) of 9 applicable reports reviewed. Additionally, the notes to the financial statements did not disclose significant violations of law for material overexpenditures at the legal level of control identified in the budgetary comparison schedules or the actions taken to address these significant violations of law for all 9 applicable reports reviewed. Also, nonrounding mathematical errors in the financial statements were found in 9 (15 percent) of the 60 reports reviewed and 7 (30 percent) of 23 applicable reports reviewed did not disclose the policy for eliminating internal activity in the statement of activities.
- We reviewed a sample of 60 audit reports with pension plan note disclosures to determine the extent of compliance with GAAP. Our review disclosed some pension plan note disclosure deficiencies. For example, for 4 (8 percent) of 50 applicable reports with defined benefit pension plans, the notes did not disclose whether the plan issues a stand-alone financial report, or was included in a report of another entity, and how such report could be obtained. Also, for 3 (12 percent) of 25 applicable reports reviewed with sole or agent employer defined benefit plans, the notes did not disclose the inflation rate assumed in the actuarial valuations.

- We reviewed a sample of 60 audit reports with other postemployment benefit (OPEB) plan note disclosures to determine the extent of compliance with GAAP. Our review disclosed a significant number of OPEB note disclosure deficiencies. For example, a statement describing the information presented in the schedule of funding progress was missing for 11 (20 percent) of 56 applicable reports reviewed. In addition, for 10 (18 percent) of 56 applicable reports reviewed, the notes did not disclose whether the plan issues a stand-alone financial report, or is included in the report of another entity, and how such report could be obtained. Also, 6 (11 percent) of 56 applicable reports reviewed did not disclose whether the amortization period used to determine the actuarially required contribution is open or closed.
- Section 10.556(6), Rules of the Auditor General, requires that the scope of the audit, when applicable, encompass the additional activities necessary to establish compliance with the Federal *Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996*, Public Law 104-156 (31 U.S.C.A. ss. 7501 to 7507); United States Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular No. A-133; other applicable Federal law; and the *Florida Single Audit Act* (i.e., Section 215.97, Florida Statutes). We reviewed a sample of 60 audit reports to determine the extent of compliance with the reporting requirements contained in OMB Circular No. A-133. We also reviewed a sample of 60 audit reports to determine the extent of compliance with the reporting requirements contained in the *Florida Single Audit Act*. Our comprehensive review disclosed various deficiencies related to Federal or State single audit requirements. For example:
 - Total amounts expended for each Federal program and State project for which multiple awards with the same Catalog³ number were reported, were not provided on 8 (18 percent) of the 44 applicable schedules of expenditures of Federal awards and on 11 (27 percent) of the 41 applicable schedules of expenditures of State financial assistance.
 - Corrective action plans for Federal awards findings did not include the name and contact information of the person responsible for the corrective action plan for 6 (55 percent) of 11 applicable reports reviewed.
 - The dollar threshold identified in the schedules of findings and questioned costs to distinguish Type A and Type B State projects was calculated incorrectly for 6 (10 percent) of the 60 reports reviewed.

A summary of the deficiencies disclosed by our comprehensive reviews, and an analysis of the deficiencies disclosed by our comprehensive reviews by type of local governmental entity, are included as Exhibit F. Because of the limited number of sample items applicable to each type of local governmental entity, we did not attempt to present comparative prior year information.

Recommendation: Local governmental entities should ensure that financial statements and note disclosures (including pension plan and OPEB disclosures) are presented in accordance with GAAP. In addition, local governmental entities and their auditors should ensure that reports and schedules are prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Federal *Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996* and the *Florida Single Audit Act*.

OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY

The objectives of this project were to determine whether the audit reports for the local governmental entities submitted to us:

- Appeared to comply with GAGAS, GAAP, and Chapter 10.550 Rules of the Auditor General; and
- Were prepared by independent CPAs properly licensed by the Florida Board of Accountancy.

The scope of this project included a review of audit reports for 66 counties, 370 municipalities, and 769 special districts (a total of 1,205 entities) prepared by independent CPAs and submitted to us by July 18, 2012, for the 2010-11 fiscal year.

³ For Federal programs, the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance, and for State projects, the Catalog of State Financial Assistance.

Our review of audit reports was conducted in accordance with applicable GAGAS. Those standards require that we plan and perform the review to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our review objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our review objectives.

Our desk review (i.e., a review that does not include an examination of the CPA's working papers) was necessarily limited to the contents of the audit reports submitted to us and did not extend to a determination of whether the auditors followed all generally accepted government auditing standards in the actual conduct of the audits. Because our review was limited to the contents of the audit reports provided to us, the review cannot be used as the basis for determining the extent of the entity's compliance with applicable laws, rules, regulations, charters, contractual requirements, or bond covenants. Likewise, our desk review would not disclose whether the auditor reported all instances of noncompliance or reportable internal control deficiencies noted during the audit, or whether certain required financial disclosures were completely omitted from the audit report.

Due to the volume of reports included in this review, evaluation criteria from our rules and report review guidelines (as discussed in the Background section) were established in the following checklists: basic completeness review, and detailed comprehensive reviews for: financial statements and notes thereto; pension plan disclosures; other postemployment benefit disclosures; and compliance with the reporting requirements contained in the Federal *Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996* and the *Florida Single Audit Act*. We applied the basic completeness review checklist to the 1,205 audit reports received by us through July 18, 2012, and applied the detailed comprehensive review checklists to a sample of 60 audit reports for each comprehensive review topic.

AUTHORITY

Section 11.45(7)(b), Florida Statutes, requires us to review, in consultation with the Florida Board of Accountancy, all local governmental entity audit reports prepared by independent CPAs and submitted pursuant to Section 218.39, Florida Statutes. Pursuant to the provisions of Section 11.45, Florida Statutes, I have directed that this report be prepared to present the results of our review of local governmental entity audit reports prepared by independent CPAs for the 2010-11 fiscal year.



David W. Martin, CPA
Auditor General

EXHIBIT A
LOCAL GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES REQUIRED TO SUBMIT AN AUDIT REPORT,
BUT DID NOT FOR THE 2010-11 FISCAL YEAR
AS OF SEPTEMBER 20, 2012

MUNICIPALITIES
Alford, Town of
Astatula, Town of
Belle Glade, City of
Boynton Beach, City of
Chattahoochee, City of
Esto, Town of
Gretna, Town of
Montverde, Town of
Noma, Town of
North Miami, City of
Quincy, City of
Springfield, City of
St. Lucie Village, Town of
Sweetwater, City of
Vernon, City of
Westville, Town of
SPECIAL DISTRICTS
Baker Fire District
Bella Verde Golf Community Development District
Buckeye Park Community Development District
Chapel Creek Community Development District
City Center Community Development District
Cordoba Ranch Community Development District
CrossCreek Community Development District
Deer Run Community Development District
Dorcas Fire District
Eastpoint Water and Sewer District
Greater Lakes/Sawgrass Bay Community Development District
Hamilton County Development Authority
Highland Meadows Community Development District
Lakeside Landings Community Development District
Morningside Community Development District
New River Community Development District
Northwest Florida Transportation Corridor Authority
Oakmont Grove Community Development District
Palm River Community Development District
Panther Trace II Community Development District
Parkway Center Community Development District

EXHIBIT A (CONTINUED)
LOCAL GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES REQUIRED TO SUBMIT AN AUDIT REPORT
BUT DID NOT FOR THE 2010-11 FISCAL YEAR
AS OF SEPTEMBER 20, 2012

SPECIAL DISTRICTS (Continued)
Pembroke Harbor Community Development District
Port St. Joe Port Authority
River Bend Community Development District
Rivercrest Community Development District
RiverPark Community Development District
Six Mile Creek Community Development District
South Fork East Community Development District
Southern Hills Plantation III Community Development District
Sunrise Lakes Phase IV Recreation District
Suwannee Valley Transit Authority
Sweetwater Creek Community Development District
Vizcaya in Kendall Community Development District
Wentworth Estates Community Development District
Westridge Community Development District
Yellow River Soil and Water Conservation District
Zephyr Ridge Community Development District

EXHIBIT B
LOCAL GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES THAT MAY HAVE BEEN REQUIRED TO PROVIDE FOR AN AUDIT,
BUT DID NOT SUBMIT AN AUDIT REPORT FOR THE 2010-11 FISCAL YEAR
AS OF SEPTEMBER 20, 2012

MUNICIPALITIES
Belleair Shore, Town of
Caryville, Town of
SPECIAL DISTRICTS
Allen Plantation Community Development District
Aqua Isles Community Development District
Bermont Drainage District
Charlotte Soil and Water Conservation District
Circle Square Woods Community Development District (dissolved 9/20/11)
City of Coral Gables Health Facilities Authority
City of Perry Community Redevelopment Agency
Duval Soil and Water Conservation District
Gretna Neighborhood Improvement District
Hillsborough Educational Facilities Authority
Hollywood Beach Community Development District
Holmes Creek Soil and Water Conservation District
Huntington Community Development District (dissolved 6/6/12)
Lee Soil and Water Conservation District
Martin County Health Facilities Authority
Polk Soil and Water Conservation District
Santa Rosa Bay Bridge Authority
Seminole County Expressway Authority (dissolved 7/1/11)
Twin Creeks Community Development District
Vizcaya Community Development District (dissolved 4/4/12)
Volusia County Industrial Development Authority
Wakulla Soil and Water Conservation District

EXHIBIT C
LOCAL GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES NOT SUBMITTING AUDIT REPORT FOR THE 2010-11 FISCAL YEAR
WITHIN 45-DAY TIME FRAME

COUNTIES	Days Late
Manatee County	31
Monroe County	3
Nassau County	38
Okaloosa County	14
MUNICIPALITIES	Days Late
Boca Raton, City of	1
Casselberry, City of	23
Center Hill, City of	45
Cinco Bayou, Town of	108
Clermont, City of	2
Cooper City, City of	1
Glen Ridge, Town of	30
Golf, Village of	10
Hollywood, City of	15
Key Biscayne, Village of	18
Lake Butler, City of	72
Lauderdale-By-The-Sea, Town of	38
Layton, City of	79
Mascotte, City of	70
Mount Dora, City of	4
Perry, City of	32
Port St. Joe, City of	2
Punta Gorda, City of	34
Sebastian, City of	49
Wellington, Village of	1
West Palm Beach, City of	4
SPECIAL DISTRICTS	Days Late
Alva Fire Protection and Rescue Service District	5
Anastasia Mosquito Control District of St. Johns County	23
Artisan Lakes Community Development District	53
Avalon Beach/Mulat Fire Protection District	96
Bahia Lakes Community Development District	21
Bainebridge Community Development District	6
Ballantrae Community Development District	23
Beacon Lakes Community Development District	1
Bobcat Trail Community Development District	38
Bridgewater Community Development District	17
Bridgewater of Wesley Chapel Community Development District	21
Brighton Lakes Community Development District	35
Campbellton-Graceville Hospital	51

EXHIBIT C (CONTINUED)
LOCAL GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES NOT SUBMITTING AUDIT REPORT FOR THE 2010-11 FISCAL YEAR
WITHIN 45-DAY TIME FRAME

SPECIAL DISTRICTS (Continued)	Days Late
Catalina at Winkler Preserve Community Development District	7
Celebration Community Development District	10
Central Florida Regional Transportation Authority (LYNX)	63
Channing Park Community Development District	3
Circa Fishhawk Community Development District	1
Coastal Lake Community Development District (dissolved 9/20/11)	15
Copperstone Community Development District	29
Country Greens Community Developments District	28
Country Walk Community Development District	35
Covington Park Community Development District	29
Deer Island Community Development District	22
Desoto County Hospital District	19
Doctors Memorial Hospital	5
Dovera Community Development District	18
Dupree Lakes Community Development District	4
Eagle Pointe Community Development District	3
East County Water Control District	4
Fishhawk Community Development District	2
Fishhawk Community Development District II	2
Fishhawk Community Development District III	2
Flora Ridge Educational Facilities Benefit District	14
Forest Brooke Community Development District	10
Glen St. Johns Community Development District	43
Greater Orlando Aviation Authority	20
Habitat Community Development District	46
Halifax Hospital Medical Center	22
Harbor Bay Community Development District	5
Harbour Isles Community Development District	15
Hawk's Point Community Development District	14
Heritage Bay Community Development District	2
Heritage Greens Community Development District	36
Heritage Landing Community Development District	54
Heritage Oak Park Community Development District	95
Heritage Palms Community Development District	7
Herons Glen Recreation District	6
Jackson County Hospital District	74
Laguna Estates Community Development District	5

EXHIBIT C (CONTINUED)
LOCAL GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES NOT SUBMITTING AUDIT REPORT FOR THE 2010-11 FISCAL YEAR
WITHIN 45-DAY TIME FRAME

SPECIAL DISTRICTS (Continued)	Days Late
Lake Bernadette Community Development District	29
Lake Region Lakes Management District	11
Lakeshore Ranch Community Development District	3
Lakeside Community Development District	21
Lee County Hyacinth Control District	1
Lee County Mosquito Control District	1
Lee County Trauma Services District	90
Lee Memorial Health System	90
Legends Bay Community Development District	36
Live Oak No. 2 Community Development District	31
Magnolia Park Community Development District	7
Magnolia West Community Development District	23
Maple Ridge Community Development District	67
Meadow Pointe III Community Development District	1
Mira Lago West Community Development District	24
New River Publix Library Cooperative	11
Oak Creek Community Development District	16
Overoaks Community Development District	35
Pine Tree Water Control District (Broward Co.)	18
Pinellas County License Board	31
Piney-Z Community Development District	68
Poinciana West Community Development District	22
Sandy Creek Community Development District	5
Seven Oaks Community Development District	3
South Central Regional Wastewater Treatment and Disposal Board	2
South Florida Regional Transportation Authority	40
St. Johns County Industrial Development Authority	3
St. Johns Forest Community Development District	80
Stonebrier Community Development District	6
Tampa Palms Community Development District	14
Tara Community Development District	1
University Place Community Development District	33
Vasari Community Development District	35
VillaSol Community Development District	2
Vista Lakes Community Development District	45
Waterlefe Community Development District (Manatee Co)	13

EXHIBIT D
LOCAL GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES SUBMITTING AUDIT REPORT FOR THE 2010-11 FISCAL YEAR
AFTER 9-MONTH DEADLINE

COUNTIES	Date Received
Broward County	07/11/12
Pasco County	07/05/12
MUNICIPALITIES	Date Received
Baldwin, Town of	07/12/12
Bartow, City of	07/17/12
Belleair, Town of	09/12/12
Biscayne Park, Village of	07/27/12
Campbellton, Town of	08/08/12
Davie, Town of	07/05/12
Deerfield Beach, City of	07/19/12
Eatonville, Town of	08/01/12
Golden Beach, Town of	09/07/12
Hawthorne, City of	08/01/12
Hilliard, Town of	08/03/12
Howey-in-the-Hills, Town of	07/11/12
Indian Creek Village	07/17/12
Lake Park, Town of	07/12/12
Loxahatchee Groves, Town of	07/16/12
Madeira Beach, City of	07/16/12
Manalapan, Town of	07/17/12
Mangonia Park, Town of	08/08/12
New Port Richey, City of	07/13/12
North Bay Village, City of	07/30/12
Oakland, Town of	08/15/12
Opa-Locka, City of	07/17/12
Pahokee, City of	08/02/12
Sewall's Point, Town of	07/12/12
Shalimar, Town of	07/17/12
Southwest Ranches, Town of	08/13/12
Treasure Island, City of	07/13/12
Webster, City of	08/09/12
Williston, City of	07/20/12
SPECIAL DISTRICTS	Date Received
Amelia Concourse Community Development District	08/09/12
Beach Mosquito Control District	07/17/12
Belmont Lakes Community Development District	08/08/12
Captiva Erosion Prevention District	07/16/12

EXHIBIT D (CONTINUED)
LOCAL GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES SUBMITTING AUDIT REPORT FOR THE 2010-11 FISCAL YEAR
AFTER 9-MONTH DEADLINE

SPECIAL DISTRICTS (Continued)	Date Received
City Gate Community Development District	09/12/12
Cypress Cove Community Development District	07/27/12
Cypress Shadows Community Development District	09/17/12
Downtown Development Authority City of Miami	07/23/12
Englewood Area Fire Control District	07/19/12
Escambia-Pensacola Human Relations Commission	09/20/12
Fiddlers Creek Community Development District	07/16/12
Fiddlers Creek Community Development District #2	08/13/12
Florosa Fire Control District	07/09/12
Gateway Services Community Development District	07/18/12
Grand Bay at Doral Community Development District	07/20/12
Hendry-LaBelle Recreation Board	09/14/12
Heritage Isles Community Development District	07/25/12
Holt Fire District	08/22/12
Landmark at Doral Community Development District	07/16/12
Palace at Coral Gables Community Development District	07/16/12
Panther Trace Community Development District	08/10/12
Pensacola-Escambia Promotion and Development Commission	07/20/12
Pine Tree Water Control District (Palm Beach Co.)	07/12/12
Polk County Industrial Development Authority	07/23/12
Polk Transit Authority	07/26/12
Preserve at Wilderness Lake Community Development District	08/09/12
Sanibel Public Library	07/16/12
Sarasota National Community Development District	07/16/12
South Dade Soil and Water Conservation District	08/31/12
Stonegate Community Development District	07/16/12
Suncoast Community Development District	08/08/12
Suwannee County Conservation District	08/30/12
Tallahassee-Leon County Civic Center Authority	08/28/12
Terra Bella Community Development District	09/20/12
Tindall Hammock Irrigation and Soil Conservation District	08/09/12
Villa Vizcaya Community Development District	09/19/12
Walton-Okaloosa/Santa Rosa Regional Utility Authority	07/16/12
Waterstone Community Development District	08/21/12
West Villages Improvement District	07/26/12

**EXHIBIT E
COMPLETENESS REVIEWS
SUMMARY OF DEFICIENCIES
FOR THE 2010-11 FISCAL YEAR**

Description of Deficiencies – Reports Reviewed for Total of 1,205 Entities	Number of Reports to Which Criteria Applied	Counties		Municipalities		Special District		Total Current Year		Prior Fiscal Year
		Number (1)	Percent (2)	Number (1)	Percent (2)	Number (1)	Percent (2)	Number (1)	Percent (3)	Percent (3)
Auditor’s Report on Internal Control Over Financial Reporting and Compliance										
Written explanation or rebuttal concerning findings and recommendations not included.	326	0	0	15	10	5	3	20	6	(4)
Reference number for each audit finding not included.	326	2	6	14	9	30	21	46	14	(5)
Description of a departure from standard auditor’s report on the financial statements not included.	35	2	50	5	33	5	31	12	34	34
Statement that noncompliance (not considered material to the financial statements) or items involving internal control over financial reporting (not considered to be significant deficiencies) were communicated to management in a separate management letter not included.	415	8	17	19	10	18	10	45	11	14
Auditor’s Management Letter										
Written explanation or rebuttal concerning findings and recommendations not included.	399	2	4	17	9	13	9	32	8	(4)
Reference numbers for each audit finding not included.	399	16	35	50	28	24	14	90	23	(5)
Uncorrected findings in the preceding financial audit report that were also included in the second preceding fiscal year financial audit report not identified.	298	14	47	47	33	25	20	86	29	(5)
Legal authority of the primary government and each component unit not included.	1,205	17	26	81	22	10	1	108	9	6
Notes to Financial Statements										
Types of investments authorized by legal or contractual provisions not disclosed.	828	0	0	42	16	12	2	54	7	12
Methods for handling risk of loss not disclosed.	1,205	1	2	15	4	69	9	85	7	7

**EXHIBIT E (CONTINUED)
COMPLETENESS REVIEWS
SUMMARY OF DEFICIENCIES
FOR THE 2010-11 FISCAL YEAR**

Description of Deficiencies – Reports Reviewed for Total of 1,205 Entities	Number of Reports to Which Criteria Applied	<u>Counties</u>		<u>Municipalities</u>		<u>Special District</u>		<u>Total Current Year</u>		<u>Prior Fiscal Year</u>
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Percent
		(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(3)	(3)
State Financial Assistance										
Schedule of expenditures of State financial assistance not included on schedule of expenditures of Federal awards.	148	2	3	5	9	4	13	11	7	8

- Notes: (1) Number of reports for which the deficiency was noted.
 (2) Percentage of reports for which the deficiency was noted. The percentage is based on the number of reports for the respective type of local government entity to which the criterion was applied.
 (3) Percentage of reports for which the deficiency was noted. The percentage is based on the total number of reports for all types of government entities to which the criterion was applied.
 (4) Percentage not reported in prior fiscal year.
 (5) New criterion effective for the 2010-11 fiscal year.

**EXHIBIT F
COMPREHENSIVE REVIEWS
SUMMARY OF DEFICIENCIES
FOR THE 2010-11 FISCAL YEAR**

Description of Deficiencies – Reports Reviewed for Total of 60 Entities	Number of Reports to Which Criteria Applied	<u>Counties</u>		<u>Municipalities</u>		<u>Special Districts</u>		<u>Total Current Year</u>	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
		(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(3)
Auditor’s Report on the Financial Statements									
Statement that the audit was conducted in accordance with <i>Government Auditing Standards</i> issued by the Comptroller General of the United States not included.	60	0	0	2	11	3	8	5	8
Auditor’s Report on Internal Control Over Financial Reporting and Compliance									
Statement that the auditor’s consideration of internal control over financial reporting is not designed to identify all deficiencies in internal control over financial reporting that might be deficiencies, significant deficiencies, or material weaknesses not disclosed.	60	0	0	1	5	2	5	3	5
Definitions of deficiency in internal control and material weaknesses not disclosed.	60	1	25	2	11	3	8	6	10
Financial Statements									
Financial statements contained mathematical errors (nonrounding).	60	2	50	5	26	2	5	9	15
Required Supplementary Information									
Condensed financial data comparing financial position and results of operations to that of the prior year not included.	55	0	0	3	17	2	6	5	9
Analysis of the balances and transactions of the individual funds and reason for significant changes not disclosed.	59	0	0	0	0	3	8	3	5
Description of significant capital asset and long-term debt activity during the year not disclosed.	52	0	0	0	0	3	10	3	6
Original budget not presented in the budgetary comparison schedule.	49	0	0	2	11	2	8	4	8
Final budget not presented in the budgetary comparison schedule.	49	0	0	0	0	3	12	3	6
Excesses of expenditures over appropriations not disclosed.	9	1	100	1	25	2	50	4	44

**EXHIBIT F (CONTINUED)
COMPREHENSIVE REVIEWS
SUMMARY OF DEFICIENCIES
FOR THE 2010-11 FISCAL YEAR**

Description of Deficiencies – Reports Reviewed for Total of 60 Entities	Number of Reports to Which Criteria Applied	<u>Counties</u>		<u>Municipalities</u>		<u>Special Districts</u>		<u>Total Current Year</u>	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
		(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(3)
Notes to the Financial Statements – Other Than Pension Plan and Other Postemployment Benefit Disclosures									
Significant violations of law for material overexpenditures at the legal level of control identified in the budgetary comparison schedule, or the actions taken to address these significant violations of law, not disclosed.	9	0	0	5	100	4	100	9	100
Totals on supporting schedules or other information in the notes to financial statements did not agree with corresponding account totals on the financial statements (nonrounding).	58	2	50	1	6	1	3	4	7
Description of the government-wide financial statements, noting that neither fiduciary funds nor component units that are fiduciary in nature are included, not disclosed.	23	0	0	2	14	1	20	3	13
Measurement focus and basis of accounting used in the government-wide financial statements not disclosed.	52	0	0	2	11	1	3	3	6
Policy for eliminating internal activity in the statement of activities not disclosed.	23	0	0	5	38	2	25	7	30
Description of the types of transactions included in program revenues not disclosed.	45	0	0	2	11	2	9	4	9
Whether deposits are covered by depository insurance not disclosed.	56	0	0	1	6	3	9	4	7
Principal and interest for long-term liabilities for each of five subsequent years and in five year increments thereafter not disclosed.	33	1	25	4	24	0	0	5	15
Details of property tax calendar not disclosed.	35	0	0	1	6	2	14	3	9
Pension Plan Financial Statement Note Disclosures									
For defined benefit plans, a brief description of the types of benefits for each plan not disclosed.	50	0	0	2	7	1	7	3	6
For defined benefit plans, whether the plan issues a stand-alone financial report, or is included in a report of another entity, and how report could be obtained not disclosed.	50	1	14	1	4	2	13	4	8

**EXHIBIT F (CONTINUED)
COMPREHENSIVE REVIEWS
SUMMARY OF DEFICIENCIES
FOR THE 2010-11 FISCAL YEAR**

Description of Deficiencies – Reports Reviewed for Total of 60 Entities	Number of Reports to Which Criteria Applied	<u>Counties</u>		<u>Municipalities</u>		<u>Special Districts</u>		<u>Total Current Year</u>	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
		(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(3)
Pension Plan Financial Statement Note Disclosures (Continued)									
For defined benefit plans, the authority under which the obligations to contribute are established or may be amended not disclosed.	50	1	14	0	0	2	13	3	6
For defined benefit plans, the required contribution rate(s) of active plan members not disclosed.	48	0	0	3	11	0	0	3	6
Inflation rate assumed in the actuarial valuations of a sole or agent employer defined benefit plan not disclosed.	25	0	0	1	6	2	29	3	12
Assumed investment return for sole or agent employer defined benefit plan not disclosed.	25	0	0	1	6	2	29	3	12
Projected salary increases for sole or agent employer defined benefit plan not disclosed.	25	0	0	1	6	2	29	3	12
Amortization period for sole or agent employer defined benefit plan not disclosed.	19	0	0	0	0	3	50	3	16
Whether the amortization period is open or closed for sole or agent employer defined benefit plan not disclosed.	19	0	0	0	0	3	50	3	16
Brief description of plan provisions and the authority under which they are established or amended for defined contribution plan not disclosed.	21	0	0	0	0	3	27	3	14
Contribution requirements of plan members, employer, and other contributing entities, in dollars or percentage of payroll, for defined contribution plan not disclosed.	21	0	0	0	0	3	27	3	14
Other Postemployment Benefit (OPEB) Plan Financial Statement Note Disclosures									
OPEB plan not identified, as to single-employer, agent multiple-employer, or cost-sharing multiple-employer plan, or name of public employee retirement system or administrator of the plan, not disclosed.	57	0	0	4	11	0	0	4	7

**EXHIBIT F (CONTINUED)
COMPREHENSIVE REVIEWS
SUMMARY OF DEFICIENCIES
FOR THE 2010-11 FISCAL YEAR**

Description of Deficiencies – Reports Reviewed for Total of 60 Entities	Number of Reports to Which Criteria Applied	<u>Counties</u>		<u>Municipalities</u>		<u>Special Districts</u>		<u>Total Current Year</u>	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
		(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(3)
Other Postemployment Benefit (OPEB) Plan Financial Statement Note Disclosures (Continued)									
Brief description of the types of benefits and the authority under which benefit provisions are established or may be amended not disclosed.	57	1	11	2	6	0	0	3	5
Whether the OPEB plan issues a stand-alone financial report or is included in the report of another entity, and if so, how to obtain the report, not disclosed.	56	1	11	7	21	2	15	10	18
Authority under which the obligations of the plan members, employer(s), and other contributing entities to contribute to the plan are established or may be amended not disclosed.	56	1	11	2	6	0	0	3	5
Statement that actuarial valuations involve estimates of values and probability of events far into the future, and are subject to continual revision not made.	56	0	0	5	15	1	8	6	11
Statement that the schedule of funding progress presents multi-year trend information about the actuarial value of plan assets relative to the actuarial accrued liability not made.	56	0	0	7	21	4	31	11	20
Statement that calculations are based on the benefits provided under the terms of the plan at the time of each valuation, and the pattern of sharing costs between employer and members not made.	56	0	0	9	26	0	0	9	16
Statement that actuarial calculations reflect long-term prospective and the methods and assumptions used are designed to reduce short-term volatility in actuarial value of assets and actuarial accrued liabilities not made.	56	1	11	7	21	0	0	8	14
Whether the amortization period used to determine the current actuarially required contribution for the OPEB plan is open or closed not disclosed.	56	0	0	2	6	4	31	6	11
Schedule of funding progress did not include the annual covered payroll.	55	2	22	2	6	1	8	5	9
Schedule of funding progress did not include the ratio of the unfunded actuarial liability/funding excess to the annual covered payroll.	55	2	22	2	6	1	8	5	9

**EXHIBIT F (CONTINUED)
COMPREHENSIVE REVIEWS
SUMMARY OF DEFICIENCIES
FOR THE 2010-11 FISCAL YEAR**

Description of Deficiencies – Reports Reviewed for Total of 60 Entities	Number of Reports to Which Criteria Applied	<u>Counties</u>		<u>Municipalities</u>		<u>Special Districts</u>		<u>Total Current Year</u>	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
		(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(3)
Federal Awards									
Total amounts expended for each Federal program, for which multiple awards with the same catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance number were reported on the schedule of expenditures of Federal awards, not provided.	44	3	21	5	21	0	0	8	18
Notes describing the significant accounting policies used in preparing schedule of expenditures of Federal awards not included.	60	2	14	1	3	0	0	3	5
Findings did not identify the federal program and specific federal award, including the CFDA title and number, the federal award number and year, the name of the federal agency, and the name of the applicable pass-through entity.	11	2	67	1	14	0	0	3	27
Name and contact information of the person responsible for the plan not included in corrective action plan for Federal program findings.	11	2	67	4	57	0	0	6	55
State Financial Assistance									
Total amounts expended for each State project, for which multiple awards with the same catalog of State Financial Assistance number were reported on the schedule of expenditures of State financial assistance, not provided.	41	6	27	4	40	1	11	11	27
Notes describing the significant accounting policies used in preparing the schedule of expenditures of State financial assistance not included.	60	0	0	3	13	0	0	3	5
Report on compliance with requirements applicable to each major project and internal control over compliance cites the Executive Office of the Governor, rather than the Florida Department of Financial Services as the authority for the State projects compliance supplement.	60	4	18	3	13	6	40	13	22
Schedule of findings and questioned costs did not show the correct dollar threshold used to distinguish Type A and Type B State projects.	60	0	0	6	26	0	0	6	10

- Notes: (1) Number of reports for which the deficiency was noted.
 (2) Percentage of reports for which the deficiency was noted. The percentage is based on the number of reports for the respective type of local government entity to which the criterion was applied.
 (3) Percentage of reports for which the deficiency was noted. The percentage is based on the total number of reports for all types of government entities to which the criterion was applied.